Applicant : Jane W. Chang et al.
Serial No. : 09/827,500
Filed : April 6, 2001
Page : 7 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 11646-013001

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 29 as originally filed, and claims 14 and 30 as presently amended, recite "outputting a prose rendition of the query," or similar language, as in claim 1. This feature is not disclosed or suggested in Khan, and thus claims 1, 14, 29 and 30 were not anticipated by or would not have been obvious from Khan. For example, Khan states "retrieved content is aggregated at a network server located remotely from the user. The network server acts as a gateway through which any content from the world wide web is collected and converted into a format amenable to the wireless device." (See col. 2, lines 10-14) This is different from "outputting a prose rendition of the query." As described in applicants' specification, "(r)eferring to FIG. 6, a prose process 140 includes receiving 142 the normalized text query. The normalized text query is converted 144 to prose and the prose displayed 146 to the user in conjunction with the results of the user query." "Prose" is defined, for example, in The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition Copyright © 2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company, as "ordinary speech or writing, without metrical structure; commonplace expression or quality."

The Examiner considers that Khan teaches outputting a prose rendition of the query at col. 18, lines 64-67. However, no such teaching of outputting a prose rendition exist at this passage or elsewhere in Khan. Khan's teaching of filter, identify and bypass does not suggest, much less describe, a prose rendition. To maintain a case of anticipation the cited reference must contain all of the claimed features. Accordingly, the Examiner cannot properly maintain this rejection since at least the feature of outputting a prose rendition is neither described nor suggested in Khan.

Claims 2-13 and 15-28 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 14, 29 and 30.

Moreover, these claims add distinctive features. For instance, claim 8 recites that outputting the prose rendition comprises processing the query in conjunction with rules of grammar; and processing the query in conjunction with a prose configuration file. Neither of these features is suggested in Khan.

Applicant : Jane W. Chang et al.
Serial No. : 09/827,500
Filed : April 6, 2001
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 11646-013001

The fact that the applicant has not responded to any stated position of the Examiner should not be construed as a concession by the applicants of those positions. The inclusion by the applicants of arguments for patentability should not be construed as a concession by the applicants that there are not other good reasons for patentability of these claims or other claims.